## 

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Richard M. Heimann (State Bar No. 63607) Kelly M. Dermody (State Bar No. 171716) Eric B. Fastiff (State Bar No. 182260) Brendan Glackin (State Bar No. 199643) Dean Harvey (State Bar No. 250298) Anne B. Shaver (State Bar No. 255928) LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTI 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3339 Telephone: 415.956.1000 Facsimile: 415.956.1008  Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)	EIN, LLP	
8 9 10 11 12 13	Lisa J. Leebove (State Bar No. 186705) James G. Dallal (State Bar No. 277826) JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, INC. 505 Montgomery, Suite 625 San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: 415.500.6800 Facsimile: 415.395.9940  Co-Lead Class Counsel  [Additional counsel listed on signature page]		
14	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
15	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
16	SAN JOSE DIVISION  Moster Declark No. 11 CV 2500 LHV		
17	IN RE: HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE ANTITRUST LITIGATION	Master Docket No. 11-CV-2509-LHK	
18	THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:	PLAINTIFFS' BRIEF REGARDING THE IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT ON PLAINTIFFS'	
19	ALL ACTIONS	SUPPLEMENT ON FLAINTIFFS SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28		DI AINTIEES' STATEMENT DEGADDING	

## Case5:11-cv-02509-LHK Document483 Filed07/26/13 Page2 of 3

Pursuant to the Court's July 14, 2013 Case Management Order (Dkt. 460), Plaintiffs
submit this brief regarding the effect of the proposed settlement between Plaintiffs and
Defendants Lucasfilm, Ltd. ("Lucasfilm") and Pixar on Plaintiffs' Supplemental Motion for Class
Certification. <sup>1</sup>

On July 12, 2013, following the all-party mediation and extensive subsequent negotiations, Plaintiffs reached a settlement with two of the seven Defendants—Pixar and Lucasfilm. With the Court's approval, the settlement will resolve all of the claims of the proposed class of technical employees, as that class has been defined by Plaintiffs in their Supplemental Motion for Class Certification (the "Technical Class"<sup>2</sup>), for settlement purposes and only as against Pixar and Lucasfilm. In other words, the proposed settlement class is coextensive with the proposed litigation class. Plaintiffs' claims against the other five Defendants—Adobe, Apple, Google, Intel, and Intuit—on behalf of the same employees will proceed. Upon completion of settlement documentation, Plaintiffs will promptly present the Court with a motion for preliminary approval of the settlement, as well as a motion for certification under Rule 23(b)(3) of the Technical Class (including employees of all of the Defendants, both settling and not settling) only for purposes of settling the claims against Lucasfilm and Pixar. Plaintiffs will suggest a schedule for the approval process in their preliminary approval moving papers.

The settlement preserves Plaintiffs' right to litigate against the non-settling Defendants for the entire amount of Plaintiffs' damages based on joint and several liability under the antitrust laws. Beyond the scheduling of preliminary and final approval motions to effectuate the settlement, there is no reason to delay or otherwise modify the litigation schedule set by the Court, including the August 8, 2013 hearing on the Supplemental Motion for Class Certification, the completion of expert discovery, dispositive motions, and trial. *See* May 15, 2013 Case Management Order (Dkt. 421).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the Court's Order of July 14 (Dkt. 460), lead trial counsel met and conferred with opposing counsel on July 24, 2013 and exchanged draft briefs.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> See Supp. Mot. at iii (Dkt. 418); Oct. 1, 2012 Expert Report of Edward Leamer, App. B (Dkt. 190).

## 

1	As certification of the class for settlement purposes is distinct from certification of the		
2	class for litigation purposes, the settlement will not have an impact on Plaintiffs' pending		
3	Supplemental Motion for Class Certification, beyond the fact that certification for litigation		
4	purposes is only sought to pursue claims against the five remaining Defendants. Generally, the		
5	same Rule 23 standard applies for certification of a proposed class, whether for litigation or		
6	settlement purposes. Amchem Prod., Inc. v. Windsor, 521 U.S. 591, 619, (1997); Hanlon v.		
7	Chrysler Corp., 150 F.3d 1011, 1019-1023 (9th Cir. 1999).		
8			
9		Respectfully submitted,	
10	Dated: July 26, 2013	LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP	
11		By: /s/ Kelly M. Dermody	
12		Kelly M. Dermody	
13		Richard M. Heimann (State Bar No. 63607) Kelly M. Dermody (State Bar No. 171716)	
14		Eric B. Fastiff (State Bar No. 182260) Brendan Glackin (State Bar No. 199643)	
15		Dean Harvey (State Bar No. 250298) Anne B. Shaver (State Bar No. 255928)	
16		275 Battery Street, 29th Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3339	
17		Telephone: 415.956.1000 Facsimile: 415.956.1008	
18		JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, INC.	
19			
20		By: /s/ Joseph R. Saveri	
21		Joseph R. Saveri	
22		Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064) Lisa J. Leebove (State Bar No. 186705)	
23		James G. Dallal (State Bar No. 277826) JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, INC	
24		255 California, Suite 450 San Francisco, CA 94111	
25		Telephone: 415. 500.6800 Facsimile: 415. 395.9940	
26		Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiff Class	
27			
28			